

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
7

8 KENNETH A. HENDREN,

9 Petitioner,

2:16-cv-00361-APG-PAL

10 vs.

ORDER

11 BRIAN E. WILLIAMS, *et al.*,

12 Respondents.
13 _____ /
14

15 In this habeas corpus action, brought *pro se* by Nevada prisoner Kenneth A. Hendren, after a
16 45-day extension of time, the respondents were due to respond to Hendren's petition for writ of
17 habeas corpus by August 4, 2016. *See* Order entered April 20, 2016 (ECF No. 5); Order entered
18 June 20, 2016 (ECF No. 9).

19 On August 4, 2016, respondents filed a motion for extension of time (ECF No. 10),
20 requesting a further 46-day extension of the time to respond to Hendren's habeas petition. Counsel
21 for respondents states that the extension of time is necessary because of his obligations in other
22 cases. The court finds that respondents' motion is made in good faith and not solely for the purpose
23 of delay, and that there is good cause for the extension of time.

24 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that respondents' Motion for Enlargement of Time (ECF
25 No. 10) is **GRANTED**. Respondents shall have until and including **September 19, 2016**, to answer
26 or otherwise respond to the habeas corpus petition in this case.

1 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, in all other respects, the schedule for further
2 proceedings set forth in the order entered on April 20, 2016 (ECF No. 5) shall remain in effect.

3
4 Dated this 8th day of August, 2016.

5
6 
7 _____
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE